



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

navy, but doubts whether, considering the present state of our finances and the unfinished condition of so many vessels already in construction, any new work should be undertaken.

FRANCE AND GERMANY.

We publish on another page in our Correspondence a letter from Professor C. A. Eggert of Vanderbilt University, Tennessee, which we are sure all our readers will be glad to see, whether they agree with its contents or not. The writer of the letter has been much in France and speaks from a personal acquaintance with the country, though we fear he has failed to see the deepest and most significant things in modern France. The question raised by the present condition of Europe is one of such magnitude and many-sidedness that we are glad to have opportunities of thinking it over anew and of restating it.

We are sure that Professor Eggert wrongly interprets the spirit of the general press of this country when he states that it shows partiality to France as against Germany. Our own reading, which is fairly extensive on this special line, leads us to the opinion that both nations in their rivalry of armaments are equally condemned by the reputable journals of this country, certain papers of course excepted which take sides and others which ignore the subject. The condemnation of France, though quite as severe, has been, it is true, less frequent for two or three years past than that of Germany, for the reason that the peculiar actions of the German Emperor and the movements of the Socialists, in a word, the great strife between the people and the military classes have brought that country prominently before the public. The press of this country, though naturally sympathizing with the republican institutions of France, looks upon her excessive armament as just as foolish and uncalled for as that of Germany, and even more out of harmony with her form of government. This is the position of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* with regard to every nation of Europe. All these vast military preparations grow out of largely groundless fear and jealousy and suspicion and false ideas of national greatness and security, and hence they are wrong, every one of them. Their existence is the gigantic crime of Europe.

Professor Eggert's position that French military vanity (he says also greed of land, which we think much less true) has been the cause of her wars in the past, is, we are sorry to have to say, too nearly literally correct. Her historic sin has been that of the love of fighting pure and simple, just as England's has been that of territorial aggrandizement. We have often heard intelligent Frenchmen say virtually the same thing. It is not rare in recent years to see in the journals of Paris the course of Napoleon I. severely condemned as one of the greatest injury to France herself. An intelligent and patriotic

Frenchman told the writer that the Napoleonic wars had cost France three invasions. That France, or rather the Imperial Court, was, in the main, responsible for the last war, there is no question. She freely confesses it herself. But it is just as true that more than one man in Germany had long been preparing for a war with France and took advantage of circumstances to hasten the crisis.

In the twenty-two years since that fateful war there has been a great change in the spirit of the French people. There is much less desire for glory by arms than formerly, even among the men who lead the nation. France, though still capable of being inflamed and carried away by excitement, in accordance with her hereditary character, would not tolerate another Napoleon I. She has come to realize, more fully than many believe, the folly as well as the danger of living by war and for war. There is not a shadow of doubt that such a change of sentiment has really taken place among the French people, though there may be many superficial reasons for believing the contrary. The treatment of General Dodds at Marseilles when he came back from the Dahomey campaign is a striking proof of this statement. Such a thing could not have occurred twenty years ago. There is a new France rapidly growing up to cast off the old one. It would be a sorry prospect for humanity, if we must believe that nations must always remain the stupid and cruel things they have been in the past.

We are glad to believe with Mr. Eggert in the peace-loving character of the German people, as he does, doubtless, with us in that of the people of France, at the present time, that is. One cannot, however, read the literature and history of Germany and travel in it and see its monuments without feeling that it has been as essentially military in the past as France. Its military spirit has been slower to act, more calm and stately, less meddlesome, less passionate and freer of frenzy, but it has been deep-seated and constant, moving coolly and doggedly to the accomplishment of its ends. For this very reason it will be no less difficult to eradicate than the militarism of France. But the tide has changed in Germany as in France. The movement against further military development there is for the most part among the people, and it will not be long till it will make itself irresistibly felt by the ruling classes. The hope of Europe lies in the people. The people of France as well as of Germany are now real lovers of peace. Neither is much behind the other, as their meetings in friendly congresses prove. They are still afflicted with much deep-seated and unreasonable distrust of each other, but this is beginning slowly and surely to break away. Every people in Europe is likewise peace-loving, and we have little doubt that if the question of general disarmament, free from entanglement with other questions, were submitted to-morrow to a direct vote of the peoples themselves, militarism would be doomed.

Professor Eggert's view that Germany's safety lies in her army is, we are well aware, in accord with the common notion in all countries. On the contrary, we believe, with the deepest conviction, that, in her case as in that of other countries, her army is precisely her chief source of danger. History proves on more than a thousand pages that "they that take the sword shall perish by the sword." Even though it may seem "to the Jews a stumbling block and to the Greeks foolishness" we declare unreservedly our belief that if Germany would boldly and courageously, alone if need be, disarm, she would be in less danger of attack from Russia and of losing her possessions on the west side of the Rhine than she is in her present condition. Her example would be so stupendously impressive that no nation in Europe could resist it. France is less likely to regain her lost provinces with every increase of her fighting strength. If she would disarm, as she ought to do, and leave the question of her claims to these provinces to be settled by something entirely different from swords and cannon, not a nation of Europe would lift a finger against her and in due time, right, whatever it is, would be done her. Her situation and, more, the character of her institutions marks her out as the nation which ought to lead in this movement. The present course of Europe is leading on inevitably to disaster and inconceivably cruel events, and we will not take the responsibility of offering a single excuse for any nation to continue its downward course. The clash of arms has been heard along the Rhine for 1400 years; every sword that is gleaming in Europe to-day ought to be put up at once and forever.

This all may seem very visionary and impracticable, and, in the present state of feeling in those countries, is doubtless so. But these feelings ought not to exist, and we shall continue to declare them wrong and their fruits also. Until they change there can be no genuine solution of the vexing problems. The right way out of the difficulty is the noblest and the safest, and others that may be tried can only lead bunglingly and with infinite slowness and disappointment to the goal which might be reached almost at once, if a nation or two had the courage boldly and without reserve to take the great step.

At the last annual meeting of the Women's Peace Association, in Manchester, England, a letter was read from a prominent English clergyman, in which he said: "Women have had a good deal to do with the admiration of military heroes. They can do much in changing popular sentiment about soldiers and soldiering," and he ends his letter with: "I hope that your association's efforts may be vigorous and effectual against that wicked and (consequently) stupid way of settling differences by murder, which has so long afflicted the world." Those who believe that the world is not yet ready for universal peace none the less admit that it will come as the centuries roll on, not "through the fitness of one nation, but the unfitness of many."—*Chicago Journal*.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

The AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY is offering this year three prizes to the members of the Senior and Junior classes in the colleges and universities of the United States for the three best essays on the "Economic Waste of War." The following letter has been addressed to the college and university Presidents, calling attention to the subject and giving the conditions of the competition:

DEAR SIR:

The American Peace Society offers this year three prizes, of \$100, \$50 and \$25, respectively, for the three best essays on the "Economic Waste of War," to be competed for by the members of the Senior and Junior classes (those in the regular courses leading to the Bachelor's degree) of the Colleges and Universities of the United States.

It is intended that the treatment of the subject shall be in the form of an argument against war. The subject may be so extended as to cover not only direct waste of money and property in war and war-preparations and the burdens of taxation, but also any consequent derangement of commerce, international distrust affecting trade relations, loss of life as affecting the productive industries, and the moral character of war so far as involved in its economic waste.

The conditions under which the prizes are offered are as follows:

1. Each College or University competing shall forward but one essay to the American Peace Society, the choice between the essays written by the Seniors and Juniors of said institution to be made by its Faculty or by judges appointed by them.
2. The essays shall contain not less than 2000 nor more than 3500 words.
3. The copies of the essays sent to the American Peace Society shall be type-written, and shall be at the disposal of the Society, to use as it may see fit.
4. The comparative merits of the essays forwarded shall be determined by a committee named by the American Peace Society, who shall render their decision on (1) the force of the argument and (2) on the general character of the composition.
5. The essays must be in the hands of the American Peace Society not later than the 15th of July, 1894.

If you think it proper to allow your Seniors and Juniors to compete for these prizes, will you kindly lay the matter before them at once and let us know as early as convenient if any of them wish to enter the competition.

A general meeting of the Austrian Peace Society was held at Vienna on the 5th of December under the presidency of the Baroness Von Suttner.